

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 14-18 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected species, the Examiner stating that there was no generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 13 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Responsive to this, claim 13 is amended according to the Examiner's instruction. Therefore, it is believed that, by the amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 5-7 and 13 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taiwan Patent No. 488354.

In addition, claims 1-2 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Macor (US-6,092,442).

Further, claims 1-2 and 4 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woods, Wuilmart or Grabovac.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 4 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Macor (US-6,092,442) in view of Woods or Grabovac.

In addition, claims 10-11 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

5 being unpatentable over Macor (US-6,092,442) in view of Lee.

Further, claim 10 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Macor (US-6,092,442) in view of Hsiao.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 3 and 8-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten 10 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 3 is deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 3 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the 15 Examiner.

In addition, claims 7 and 8 are deleted, and claim 5 is amended to form an independent claim which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 5, 7 and 8 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-11 and 13 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that
5 the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

**This Amendment has been prepared by Applicant and is being filed by
10 the undersigned attorney without substantial change.**

Respectfully submitted,



Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration No. 26,049

Dated: 18 November 2004

15
Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
20 3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Customer No.
04586